



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,750	08/22/2005	Alexander C. Riseman	E3331.0657	2077

32172 7590 10/06/2008

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE)
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER

AMELUNXEN, BARBARA J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3694

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/525,750	Applicant(s) RISEMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Barbara J. Amelunxen	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-32 and 35-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :02/25/05, 09/07/05, 10/20/05, & 04/12/2007.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In response to Examiner's Requirement for Restriction/Election of US Application No. 10/525,750, Applicant's election of Claims 1-19 and 33-34 in the reply filed on August 1, 2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Therefore, this restriction is FINAL.

2. In the present application, Claims 1-41 are pending. Claims 1-19 and 33-34 are being considered below.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers filed under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d) based on an application filed in WTO country on February 25, 2005. Applicant has not complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.63(c), since the oath, declaration or application data sheet does not acknowledge the filing of any foreign application. A new oath, declaration or application data sheet is required in the body of which the present application should be identified by application number and filing date.

In oath and declaration, the applicant claimed the provisional application 60/408,180 as foreign priority data. The provisional application 60/408,180 should be claimed under 35 U.S.C 119 (e) or 120) as prior U. S. application. The PCT/US2003/027333 should be claimed under 119 (a)-(d) as foreign priority. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-19 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6. Claims 1, 17, and 18 recite “[a] method of processing deal information relating to trades of a fungible instrument...” and are directed to purely mental steps. In order for a method to be considered a "process" under § 101, a claimed process must either (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-788 (1876)). If

neither of these requirements is met by the claims, the method is not a patent eligible process under § 101 and is non-statutory subject matter, as is the case of Claims 1, 17 and 18. Thus, to qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example, by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example, by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

7. Furthermore, regarding Claim 1-19 and 33-34, it has been held that in order to be statutory under 35 USC 101, a claim has to produce a **useful, concrete and tangible result**. However, Claims 1, 17, 18, 33, and 34 merely recite the steps of “receiving”, “deriving”, and “filtering”. The claims lack the required result (*State Street Bank & Trust Co. v Signature Financial Group*, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 149 F 3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. July 23, 1998)), as they fail to disclose enough information about the invention to make the usefulness immediately apparent to those familiar with the technological field of computer related inventions (MPEP 2107.01; *Brenner v. Mason*, 383 U.S. 519, 148 USPQ 689 (1966); *In re Fisher*, 76 USPQ2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *In re Ziegler*, 26 USPQ2d 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). For example, Claims 1, 17, 18, 33, and 34 a “minimum indicative rate spread” which is broader than the “range of the inside market” of Gilbert et al (US 2003/0088501). Thus, the invention does not give out the real range of the inside market numbers, except to the paid subscriber (see Specification, [¶0005]: “...the data provider may wish to keep the actual rates information confidential”). Thus,

the invention conceals the actual numbers, as the system provides for withholding the inside market spread, and it may seem not inventive to withhold desired information. In addition, as stated in the invention: “It is desirable to be able to provide a data feed, which, while indicative of current rates in the market, does not provide those exact rates” (see Specification, [¶0005]). Determining less accurate values may seem like taking a step backwards as evidenced in Gilbert et al (US 2003/0088501) indicating that the best price spread is preferred. The invention is thus directed to a non-preferred system in order to get customers to buy preferred data (see Applicant’s Specification, [¶0005]).

8. As to Claims 33 and 34, they are directed to the steps of “*receiving*” and “*deriving*”, which merely describe steps or goals in the plan, and do not recite how those steps are implemented in some physical way: Thus, the steps remain disembodied. The claims are absent of any technology for implementing the claimed method. Therefore, each claim is directed to a mere abstract idea and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as they do not define a transformation of physical subject matter.

9. In addition, Claims 33 and 34 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as they are directed to a “*computer program product*”. However, a “*computer program product*” is merely software and it has been held that software without a required computer-readable medium-storing the software that, when executed, causes the

computer to perform a particular process or method (MPEP 2106.01) is merely nonfunctional descriptive material and non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

10. Therefore, Claims 2-16 and 19 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as they depend on Claims 1 and 18 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 1, 3, 17, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gilbert et al. (US 2003/00888501, hereinafter referred to as “Gilbert”)

Regarding Claims 1, 17, 33, and 34: Gilbert discloses: A method of processing deal information relating to trades of a fungible instrument, comprising the steps of:

- receiving best price bid and offer rates for transactions in the instrument [¶¶ 0008, 0054-0055]; and
- deriving indicative bid and offer rates from the best price bid and offer rates by defining a minimum indicative rates spread between bid and offer prices and adjusting the best price rates to maintain a spread greater or equal to the defined minimum indicative rates spread and greater than the best price spread [¶¶ 0008, 0010]. Gilbert further teaches: “*Qualified traders may be traders that are associated with the best bids and offers. The best bids and offers are bids and offers in the general market that have prices that meet predetermined criteria. The predetermined criteria may include, for example, prices that are within a predetermined range of the market price (e.g., all bids and offers that are within 0.05 of the market price qualify for being admitted into the inside market) or when the number of users joined associated with the best price is greater than or equal to a predetermined number or when the spread (e.g., difference) between the bid and offer prices is less than a predetermined difference. When a particular trader meets*

the criteria and is granted access to the inside market, that trader may be provided with an opportunity to participate in an inside market. The inside market is similar with respect to the general market, except that only bid and offer prices that improve on the general market price will be accepted for this inside market session. Also, only those traders accepted into the inside market session will be able to trade within the inside market.” [¶ 0010]. It should be noted that a predetermined criteria can be set at any value, while the predetermined difference (e.g., “adjusting”) can be larger than the actual spread.

Regarding Claim 3: Gilbert and Silverman disclose the previous claims. Gilbert discloses: wherein the best price bid and offer rates are received from an anonymous trading system [¶¶ 0010, 0034, 0039].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 2, 4, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert et al. (US 2003/00888501, hereinafter referred to as “Gilbert”), in view of Silverman et al (US 5,136,501, hereinafter referred to as “Silverman”)

Regarding Claim 2: Gilbert discloses: wherein the best price bid and offer rates are received from an automated trading system [¶¶ 0004, 0029, 0034, 0039].

In addition, Silverman is even more explicit than Gilbert, in stating the use of an automated stock exchange, U.S. Pat. No. 4,412,287, in which a computer matches buy and sell orders for a variety of stocks (Column 1, Lines 51-56).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teaching with Silverman's to fully automate the system.

Regarding Claim 4: Gilbert discloses: wherein the step of deriving indicative bid and offer rates comprises setting the indicative rate bid and offer prices to the received best bid and offer prices, and alternately adding an amount to the indicative offer rates and subtracting an amount from the indicative bid rates until the spread between the indicative bid and offer rates is greater than or equal to the predefined minimum

indicative rates spread and greater than the spread between the best bid and offer prices [¶¶ 0010, 0032, 0034, 0039]. Thus, Gilbert states that the predetermined criteria means that the value can be set as desired. While Silverman states that: *“Preferably, in the system of the present invention, at all times the system will display the best inside price for every instrument traded on the system. The best inside price is preferably defined to be the highest value bid and the lowest value offer in the system.”* (Column 6, Lines 47-63; Column 13, Lines 14-55; Column 18, Lines 10-66).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teaching with Silverman's to display less than the best inside price, as it is implicit.

Regarding Claim 6: Gilbert discloses the previous claim. Gilbert does not specifically disclose: comprising periodically repeating the derivation of the indicative rates.

However, Silverman does disclose: comprising periodically repeating the derivation of the indicative rates (Column 6, Lines 37-38). It should be noted that Silverman's *“real time”* is the same as periodically updating the information.

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teaching with Silverman's to periodically repeat the derivation of the indicative rates.

Regarding Claim 7: Gilbert discloses the previous claim and discloses: comprising repeating the derivation of the indicative rates if a received best bid or offer is outside the range of the indicative rates instrument [¶¶ 0008, 0010, 0032, 0034, 0039,

0054-0055]. Thus, Gilbert states that the predetermined criteria means that the value can be set as desired. While Silverman states that: *“Preferably, in the system of the present invention, at all times the system will display the best inside price for every instrument traded on the system. The best inside price is preferably defined to be the highest value bid and the lowest value offer in the system.”* (Column 6, Lines 47-63; Column 13, Lines 14-55; Column 18, Lines 10-66).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teaching with Silverman's to repeat the derivation of the indicative rates if a received best bid or offer is outside the range of the indicative rates instrument.

Regarding Claim 8: Gilbert discloses the previous claim and discloses: comprising repeating the derivation of the indicative rates if the best prices spread widens such that the best prices are the same as the indicative rates instrument [¶¶ 0008, 0010, 0032, 0034, 0039, 0054-0055]. Thus, Gilbert states that the predetermined criteria means that the value can be set as desired. While Silverman states that: *“Preferably, in the system of the present invention, at all times the system will display the best inside price for every instrument traded on the system. The best inside price is preferably defined to be the highest value bid and the lowest value offer in the system.”* (Column 6, Lines 47-63; Column 13, Lines 14-55; Column 18, Lines 10-66).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teaching with Silverman's to repeat the derivation of the indicative rates if the best prices spread widens such that the best prices are the same as the indicative rates instrument.

Regarding Claim 9: Gilbert discloses the previous claim and discloses: comprising repeating the derivation of the indicative rates if the best prices spread plus a predetermined amount is less than the indicative rates spread and the indicative rates spread is greater than the minimum indicative rates spread [¶¶ 0008, 0010, 0032, 0034, 0039, 0054-0055]. Thus, Gilbert states that the predetermined criteria means that the value can be set as desired. While Silverman states that: *“Preferably, in the system of the present invention, at all times the system will display the best inside price for every instrument traded on the system. The best inside price is preferably defined to be the highest value bid and the lowest value offer in the system.”* (Column 6, Lines 47-63; Column 13, Lines 14-55; Column 18, Lines 10-66).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teaching with Silverman's to repeat the derivation of the indicative rates if the best prices spread plus a predetermined amount is less than the indicative rates spread and the indicative rates spread is greater than the minimum indicative rates spread. Therefore, it is implicit that it is probably necessary to recalculate so that the “predetermined criteria” is maintained.

15. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert et al. (US 2003/00888501, hereinafter referred to as “Gilbert”), in view of Silverman et al (US 5,136,501, hereinafter referred to as “Silverman”), in further view of Togher et al. (US 6,014,627, hereinafter referred to as “Togher”)

Regarding Claim 5: Gilbert and Silverman disclose the previous claims.

Gilbert and Silverman do not specifically disclose: wherein the amount added or subtracted is a single pip.

However, Togher does disclose: wherein the amount added or subtracted is a single pip (**Fig. 2**; “Pips” **24, 26** portion of the Dealable price; Column 7, Lines 6-19; Column 8, Lines 19-29; Column 10, Lines 13-28; Column 11, Lines 18-51).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert and Silverman’s teachings with Togher’s to add or subtract a single pip.

16. Claims 10-16 and Claim 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert et al. (US 2003/00888501, hereinafter referred to as “Gilbert”), in view of Brian T. Dawson (US 2002/0042765, hereinafter referred to as “Dawson”)

Regarding Claim 10: Gilbert discloses the previous claim.

Gilbert does not specifically disclose: comprising repeating the derivation of the indicative rates if one or both of the bid and offer sides of the best prices are unavailable and are then restored.

However, Dawson does disclose: comprising repeating the derivation of the indicative rates if one or both of the bid and offer sides of the best prices are unavailable and are then restored [¶¶ 0246-0266, 0272].

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teachings with Dawson's to repeat the derivation of the indicative rates if one or both of the bid and offer sides of the best prices are unavailable and are then restored by adding an anomaly.

Regarding Claim 11: Gilbert discloses the previous claim.

Gilbert does not specifically disclose: comprising distributing the derived indicative rates to subscribers.

However, Dawson does disclose: comprising distributing the derived indicative rates to subscribers [¶¶ 0117, 0121, 0492-0493, 0502, 0514]

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teachings with Dawson's to distribute the derived indicative rates to subscribers.

Regarding Claim 12: Gilbert discloses the previous claim.

Gilbert does not specifically disclose: wherein the distribution of indicative rates comprises forming an indicative rates panel for distribution and display at the subscribers.

However, Dawson does disclose: wherein the distribution of indicative rates comprises forming an indicative rates panel for distribution and display at the subscribers [¶¶ 0098-0099, 0107, 0117, 0492, 0502, 0514].

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teachings with Dawson's to distribute an indicative rates panel for distribution and display at the subscribers.

Regarding Claim 13: Gilbert discloses the previous claim.

Gilbert does not specifically disclose: comprising deriving a market high rate and market low rate from the best bid and offer prices and distributing the market high rate and market low rate to subscribers.

However, Dawson does disclose: comprising deriving a market high rate and market low rate from the best bid and offer prices and distributing the market high rate and market low rate to subscribers [¶¶ 0024, 0026, 0082-0083, 0092, 0097, 0101, 0105, 0117, 0165, 0173, 0175-0176, 0183-0184, 0190, 0197, 0203, 0492, 0502, 0514].

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teachings with Dawson's to derive a market high rate and market low rate from the best bid and offer prices and distributing the market high rate and market low rate to subscribers.

Regarding Claim 14: Gilbert and Dawson disclose the previous claims.

Gilbert discloses: wherein the derivation of the market high and low rates comprises discarding from the received best bids and offers bids and offer prices for which less than a predetermined volume has been dealt at that price between a predetermined number of counterparties over a predetermined period (**Fig. 5**; [¶¶ 0036, 0059, 0062]).

Regarding Claim 15: Gilbert and Dawson disclose the previous claims.

Gilbert discloses: comprising recording absolute market high and market low rates [¶¶ 0007, 0036].

Regarding Claim 16: Gilbert and Dawson disclose the previous claims.

Gilbert discloses: comprising distributing the absolute market high and low rates to subscribers [¶¶ 0007, 0036].

Regarding Claim 18: Gilbert discloses: A method of processing deal information relating to trades of a fungible instrument, comprising the steps of:

- receiving best price bid and offer rates for transactions in the instrument (See Gilbert: [¶¶ 0008, 0054-0055]); and
- Gilbert does not disclose: filtering received best price bid and offer rates to remove high frequency fluctuations in the received rates to obtain indicative bid and offer rates, the indicative rates being adjusted only to maintain a predetermined minimum spread.

However, Dawson does disclose: filtering received best price bid and offer rates to remove high frequency fluctuations in the received rates to obtain indicative bid and offer rates, the indicative rates being adjusted only to maintain a predetermined minimum spread (Abstract; [¶¶ 0020, 0023, 0027-0030, 0032, 0046, 0122, 0124, 0131]).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert's teachings with Dawson's to derive a filtering system to remove fluctuations according to certain criteria, in order to obtain indicative rates, thereby maintaining a predetermined minimum spread.

17. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert et al. (US 2003/00888501, hereinafter referred to as "Gilbert"), in view of Brian T. Dawson (US 2002/0042765, hereinafter referred to as "Dawson"), in further view of Silverman et al (US 5,136,501, hereinafter referred to as "Silverman")

Regarding Claim 19: Gilbert and Dawson disclose the previous claim. Gilbert discloses: wherein the adjusting of the indicative rates comprises adjusting the received best price bid and offer rates to maintain a bid/offer price spread greater or equal to a defined minimum rates spread and greater than the best price bid and offer rates spread. [¶¶ 0010, 0032, 0034, 0039]. Thus, Gilbert states that the predetermined criteria means that the value can be set as desired.

While Silverman states that: *"Preferably, in the system of the present invention, at all times the system will display the best inside price for every instrument traded on the system. The best inside price is preferably defined to be the highest value bid and*

the lowest value offer in the system.” (Column 6, Lines 47-63; Column 13, Lines 14-55; Column 18, Lines 10-66).

It would have been obvious to modify Gilbert and Dawson's teachings with Silverman's to adjust the received best price bid and offer rates to maintain a bid/offer price spread greater or equal to a defined minimum rates spread and greater than the best price bid and offer rates spread.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Finkelstein, Ephraim Brian et al. (US 20010037284) disclose: Negotiated right exchange system and method.
- Selleck, Mark N. (US 20010049651) discloses: Global trading system and method.

- Neyman, Vladimir et al. (US 20020107781) disclose: Compound order handling in an anonymoustrading system.
- OLSEN R B et al. (US 20020156718) disclose: On-line currency trading system using Internet, comprises server front-end, database, transaction server, rate server and pricing engine.
- Myr, David (US 20050283422) disclose: Centralized electronic currency trading exchange.
- Pinkava; Pavel (US 20060224491) discloses: Trading and settling enhancements to the standard electronic futures exchange market model leading to novel derivatives including on exchange ISDA type credit derivatives and entirely new recovery products including novel options on these.
- Bauerschmidt; Paul Andrew et al. (US 20070118459) disclose: System and method for centralized clearing of over the counter foreign exchange instruments.
- Sandor; Richard et al. (US 20070192221) disclose: PRESENT VALUATION OF EMISSION CREDIT AND ALLOWANCE FUTURES.
- Olsen; Richard B. et al. (US 7146336) disclose: Currency trading system, methods, and software.
- Gershon; David (US 7315838) disclose: Method and system for pricing options.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara Joan Amelunxen whose telephone number is (571) 270-5297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday -- 07:30-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. J. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 3694

September 24, 2008

Application/Control Number: 10/525,750

Art Unit: 3694

Page 21

Paper No. 20080924

/Mary Cheung/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694